COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

4

5 6

7 8

9

12

11

13

15

17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

INTRODUCTION

This civil rights action seeks compensatory and punitive damages from 1. Defendants for violating various rights under the United States Constitution and state law in connection with the police shooting of Plaintiff.

PARTIES

- At all relevant times, Robert Contreras ("PLAINTIFF") was an 2. individual residing in County of Los Angeles, California.
- 3. At all relevant times, Defendant CITY OF LOS ANGELES ("CITY") is and was a duly organized public entity, form unknown, existing under the laws of the State of California. At all relevant times, CITY was the employer of Defendants JULIO BENAVIDES, MARIO FLORES and DOES 1-4, who were CITY Police Officers, DOES 5-6, who were CITY supervisorial officers, and DOES 7-10, who 14 were managerial, supervisorial, and policymaking employees of the CITY Police Department. On information and belief, at all relevant times, DOES 1-10 were residents of County of Los Angeles, California. DOES 1-10 are sued in their individual capacity.
 - At all relevant times, Defendants DOES 1-10 were duly authorized employees and agents of CITY, who were acting under color of law within the course and scope of their respective duties as police officers and with the complete authority and ratification of their principal, Defendant CITY.
 - At all relevant times, Defendants DOES 1-10 were duly appointed 5. deputies and/or employees or agents of CITY, subject to oversight and supervision by CITY's elected and non-elected officials.
 - In doing the acts and failing and omitting to act as hereinafter described, Defendants DOES 1-10 were acting on the implied and actual permission and consent of CITY.

12 13

14

15

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

26 27

28

- 7. At all times mentioned herein, each and every CITY defendant was the agent of each and every other CITY defendant and had the legal duty to oversee and supervise the hiring, conduct and employment of each and every CITY defendant.
- The true names of defendants DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, are 8. unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sue these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this complaint to show the true names and capacities of these defendants when they have been ascertained. Each of the fictitious named defendants is responsible in some manner for the conduct and liabilities alleged herein.
- 9. On March 10, 2009, PLAINTIFF's criminal proceedings stemming from the officer involved shooting ended, thereby, tolling the statute of limitations for civil rights claims brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, until March 10, 2011.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 10. This civil action is brought for the redress of alleged deprivations of constitutional rights as protected by 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, 1986, 1988, and the Fourth Amendments of the United States Constitution. Jurisdiction is founded on 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, and 1367.
- Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), because 11. Defendants reside in, and all incidents, events, and occurrences giving rise to this action occurred in, the County of Los Angeles, California.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

- 12. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 11 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.
- 13. On or about September 3, 2005, near the intersection of Broadway and Main Street in the City of Los Angeles Defendants JULIO BENAVIDES and

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

MARIO FLORE discharged their firearms at PLAINTIFF, striking him several times, causing PLAINTIFF serious physical injury including permanent paralysis.

At the time of the shooting, PLAINTIFF was unarmed and posed no imminent threat of death or serious physical injury to either officer or any other person.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Unreasonable Search and Seizure and Due Process—Excessive Force and Denial of Medical Care (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

(Against Defendants JULIO BENAVIDES and MARIO FLORE)

- Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 15. through 14 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.
- Defendants JULIO BENAVIDES and MARIO FLORE unjustified 16. shooting deprived PLAINTIFF of his right to be secure in his persons against unreasonable searches and seizures as guaranteed to PLAINTIFF under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and applied to state actors by the Fourteenth Amendment.
- The unreasonable use of force by Defendants JULIO BENAVIDES and 17. MARIO FLORE deprived the PLAINTIFF of his right to be secure in his person against unreasonable searches and seizures as guaranteed to PLAINTIFF under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and applied to state actors by the Fourteenth Amendment.
- As a result, PLAINTIFF suffered extreme pain and suffering and 18. eventually suffered permanent paralysis and loss of earning capacity.
- As a result of the conduct of Defendants JULIO BENAVIDES and 19. MARIO FLORES, they are liable for PLAINTIFF's injuries, either because they

were integral participants in the excessive force, or because they failed to intervene to prevent these violations.

- 20. Defendants JULIO BENAVIDES and MARIO FLORES knew that failure to provide timely medical treatment to PLAINTIFF could result in further significant injury or the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain, but disregarded that serious medical need, causing him great bodily harm.
- 21. This use of force was excessive and unreasonable under the circumstances. Defendants' actions thus deprived PLAINTIFF of his right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures under the Fourth Amendment and applied to state actors by the Fourteenth Amendment.
- 22. The conduct of Defendants JULIO BENAVIDES and MARIO FLORES was willful, wanton, malicious, oppressive and done with reckless disregard for the rights and safety of PLAINTIFF and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive damages as to Defendants JULIO BENAVIDES and MARIO FLORES.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Municipal Liability for Unconstitutional Custom or Policy (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

(Against Defendants DOES 7-10 and CITY)

- 23. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 22 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.
- 24. On and for some time prior to September 3, 2005 (and continuing to the present date) Defendants DOES 7-10, deprived PLAINTIFF of the rights and liberties secured to him by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, in that said defendants and their supervising and managerial employees, agents, and representatives, acting with gross negligence and with reckless and deliberate indifference to the rights and liberties of the public in

general, and of PLAINTIFF, and of persons in their class, situation and comparable position in particular, knowingly maintained, enforced and applied an official recognized custom, policy, and practice of:

- (a) Employing and retaining as police officers and other personnel, including Defendants JULIO BENAVIDES and MARIO FLORES, who Defendants DOES 7-10, at all times material herein knew or reasonably should have known had dangerous propensities for abusing their authority and for mistreating citizens by failing to follow written CITY Police Department's policies, including the use of excessive force;
- (b) Of inadequately supervising, training, controlling, assigning, and disciplining CITY Police Officers, and other personnel, including Defendants JULIO BENAVIDES and MARIO FLORES, who Defendants CITY knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known had the aforementioned propensities and character traits, including the propensity for violence and the use of excessive force;
- (c) By maintaining grossly inadequate procedures for reporting, supervising, investigating, reviewing, disciplining and controlling the intentional misconduct by Defendants JULIO BENAVIDES and MARIO FLORES, who are Police Officers of CITY;
- (d) By failing to discipline CITY Police Officers' conduct, including but not limited to, unlawful detention and excessive force;
- (e) By ratifying the intentional misconduct of Defendants JULIO BENAVIDES and MARIO FLORES, who are Police Officers of CITY;

- (f) By having and maintaining an unconstitutional policy, custom, and practice of detaining and arresting individuals without probable cause or reasonable suspicion, and using excessive force, including deadly force, which also is demonstrated by inadequate training regarding these subjects. The policies, customs, and practices of DOES 7-10, were done with a deliberate indifference to individuals' safety and rights; and
- (g) By failing to properly investigate claims of unlawful detention and excessive force by CITY Police Officers.
- 25. By reason of the aforementioned policies and practices of Defendants DOES 7-10, PLAINTIFF was severely injured and subjected to pain and suffering.
- 26. Defendants DOES 3-10, together with various other officials, whether named or unnamed, had either actual or constructive knowledge of the deficient policies, practices and customs alleged in the paragraphs above. Despite having knowledge as stated above these defendants condoned, tolerated and through actions and inactions thereby ratified such policies. Said defendants also acted with deliberate indifference to the foreseeable effects and consequences of these policies with respect to the constitutional rights of PLAINTIFF and other individuals similarly situated.
- 27. By perpetrating, sanctioning, tolerating and ratifying the outrageous conduct and other wrongful acts, Defendants DOES 7-10, acted with an intentional, reckless, and callous disregard for the life of PLAINTIFF and his constitutional rights. Defendants DOES 7-10, each of their actions were willful, wanton, oppressive, malicious, fraudulent, and extremely offensive and unconscionable to any person of normal sensibilities.
- 28. Furthermore, the policies, practices, and customs implemented and maintained and still tolerated by Defendants DOES 7-10, were affirmatively linked to and were a significantly influential force behind the injuries of PLAINTFF.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

DATED: February 16, 2011

LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO

Dale K. Galipo Attorney for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT CONTRERAS

Plaintiff

V.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, JULIO BENA VIDES, MARIO FLORES, and DOES 1-10, inclusive

Defendants

CV11 01480 SS

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, JULIO BENA VIDAS, MARIO FLORES, and DOES 1-10 inclusive City Hall
Los Angeles City Clerk
200 North Spring St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 485-2121

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO Dale K. Galipo, Esq. (CA SBN: 144074) 21800 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 310 Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Telephone: (818) 347-3333 / Facsimile: (818) 347-4118

Email: dalekgalipo@yahoo.com/dgalipo@galipolaw.com

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

Date: February 17, 2011

Signature of Clerkon Daniel

CLERK OF COURT

1481

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

(a) PLAINTIFFS (Check ROBERT CONT	elf [])	DEFENDANTS CITY OF LOS ANGELES; JUILIO BENA VIDAS; MARIO FLORES; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,			
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, yourself, provide same.) Dale K. Galipo, Esq. LAW OFFICES OF I 21800 Burbank Bould Woodland Hills, CA Telephone (818) 347-Facsimile (818) 347-E-mail: dalekgalipo@	(CA SBN: 144074) DALE K. GALIPO evard, Suite 310 91367 -3333		Attorneys (If Known)		· .
	ON (Place an X in one box only.)	III. CITIZE	NSHIP OF PRINCIPAL A X in one box for plaintiff	PARTIES - For Diversity Co	ases Only
1 U.S. Government Plaintifi	Government Not a Par	.		PTF DEF	or Principal Place 4 4
2 U.S. Government Defende	ant 4 Diversity (Indicate Cit of Parties in Item III)	0.112511 07711		of Business in 2	and Principal Place 5 5 Another State
I ODYODI (DI		Citizen or Sul	oject of a Foreign Country	3 3 Foreign Natio	<u>n</u>
7. ORIGIN (Place ari X in or					
	oved from 3 Remanded from Court Appellate Court	reobelien			District Judge from
REQUESTED IN COMPL	AINT: JURY DEMAND: X	es No (Check 'Yes'	only if demanded in comp	aint.)	itigation Magistrate Judge
ASS ACTION under F.R.C	.P. 23: Yes 🔀 No		MONEY DEMANDED	IN COMPLAINT: \$	
I. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cit	te the U. S. Civil Statute under wh	igh you are Climan			atabata 1
			Denial of Medical C	are (42 U.S.C & 1983)	Municipal Liability for
		S.C § 1983)		(5 52),	
II. NATURE OF SUIT (Place	e an X in one box only.)				
AND STATE OF THE S		Te State (februarie) (kilotek			
400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust	110 Insurance 120 Marine				710 Fair Labor Standards
430 Banks and Banking	130 Miller Act	310 Airplane 315 Airplane Prod	uct 370 Other Fraud	510 Motions to Vac	ate Act
450 Commerce/ICC	140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lend	Sentence Habea	La raconnight.
Rates/etc.	150 Recovery of	320 Assault, Libel	& 380 Other Person	al 530 General	Relations
460 Deportation	Overpayment &	Slander	Property Dar		730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting &
470 Racketeer Influenced	Enforcement of	330 Fed. Employer	rs' 🔲 385 Property Dan	nage 540 Mandamus/	Disclosure Act
and Corrupt Organizations	Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Liability	Product Liab	ility Other	740 Railway Labor Act
480 Consumer Credit	151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted	340 Marine 345 Marine Produc			790 Other Labor
490 Cable/Sat TV	Student Loan (Excl.	Liability	t 22 Appeal 28 US	The state of the s	
810 Selective Service	Veterans)	350 Motor Vehicle			791 Empl. Ret. Inc.
850 Securities/Commodities/		355 Motor Vehicle			Security Act
Exchange	Overpayment of	Product Liabil		610 Agriculture 620 Other Food &	820 Copyrights
875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410	Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	360 Other Personal	441 Voting	Drug	830 Patent
890 Other Statutory Actions	190 Other Contract	Injury	442 Employment	625 Drug Related	840 Trademark
891 Agricultural Act	195 Contract Product	362 Personal Injury Med Malpracti	- IIII 142 TOMBRETACCO	- Seizure of	
892 Economic Stabilization	Liability	365 Personal Injury	mmodations 444 Welfare	Property 21 USO	C [61 HIA(1395ff)
Act	196 Franchise	Product Liabili	ty 1445 American mis	881 1	862 Black Lung (923)
893 Environmental Matters	के इंग्लिमियाल मास्याप्त	368 Asbestos Perso	nal Disabilities –	640 R.R.& Truck	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW
894 Energy Allocation Act	210 Land Condemnation	Injury Product	Employment	650 Airline Regs	405(g))
895 Freedom of Info. Act	220 Foreclosure	Liability	446 American with	660 Occupational	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))
900 Appeal of Fee Determi- nation Under Equal	230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	462 Naturalization	231040111403	Safety /Health	
Access to Justice	240 Torts to Land	Application	Other 440 Other Civil	690 Other	870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff
950 Constitutionality of State	245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	463 Habeas Corpus			or Defendant)
Statutes	L 200 All Ouler Real Property	Alien Detainee			871 IRS-Third Party 26
		465 Other Immigrat			USC 7609
		Actions			
	Case Number:	E OF PODAS		W11 01	480
77 (04 (07)		E OF FURIN CV-71,	COMPLETE THE INFO	RMATION REQUESTED 1	BELOW.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

II(a). IDENTICAL CASES: 1 yes, list case number(s):	Has this action been p	previously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed? No Yes		
II(b). RELATED CASES: Ha	ive any cases been pr	eviously filed in this court that are related to the present case? 🛛 No 🔲 Yes		
vil cases are deemed related i	a nreviously filed c	ase and the present and		
heck all boxes that apply)	A. Arise from the sarB. Call for determinaC. For other reasons	the or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or ation of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.		
. VENUE: (When completing t	he following informa	ation, use an additional sheet if necessary.)		
Check here if the government	ct; California County t, its agencies or emp	outside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. sloyees is a named plaintiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b).		
County in this District:*		California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
OUNTY OF LOS ANGE	LES			
	et; California County t, its agencies or emp	outside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. loyees is a named defendant. If this box is checked, go to item (c).		
County in this District:*	· <u></u>	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
OUNTY OF LOS ANGE	LES			
List the County in this District Note: In land condemnation	t; California County cases, use the locat	outside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.		
ounty in this District:*		California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
OUNTY OF LOS ANGE				
os Angeles, Orange, San Bern te: In land condemnation cases,	ardino, Riverside, V use the location of th	Jentura, Sauta Barbara, or San Luis Obispo Gounties e tract of land involved		
SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY	/	M / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /		
but is used by the Clerk of the	Court for the purpose	vil Cover Sheet and the information contained therein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings ved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3 -1 is not filed of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)		
to Statistical codes relating to S				
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action		
861	НІА	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))		
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)		
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))		
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))		
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.		
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42		

CIVIL COVER SHEET

Page 2 of 2

-71 (05/08)